

# Business-Technology Alignment (BTA)

## AWG Meeting Minutes

### 12/06/01

<b>Location:</b>	830 1 <sup>st</sup> Street, NW, WDC (room 34D), 11:00 –12:00
<b>Attendees:</b>	Denise Hill, SFA Paul Hill, SFA Bill Bush, SFA Martin Renwick, SFA (representing Robert Laurence) Paul Stonner, SFA John Bogasky, Mod Partner Peter Elms, Mod Partner Linh Nguyen, Mod Partner Paul Peck, Mod Partner Jamal Shah, Mod Partner Karen Anderson, Mod Partner Michael Bruce, Mod Partner Bill Hughes, Mod Partner Elisabeth Schmidt, Mod Partner Bill Walsleben, Mod Partner Ray Thomas, CSC (representing Jerry Ryzner) Katie Crowley, Mod Partner
<b>Absent:</b>	Anna Allen, SFA Robert Laurence, SFA (represented by Martin Renwick)
<b>Agenda:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Discuss and clarify roles of AWG and ASG members</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> AWG sponsorship for investigation of encryption standards</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Socialize/ build awareness of BTA deliverables</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Identify which enterprise-wide issues to address during following AWG sessions</li> </ul>
<b>Issues/Risks:</b>	<p><b>Issue:</b> Need business unit views about who owns/maintains common user data (see action to be undertaken by Paul Stonner)</p> <p><b>Issue:</b> Who will bear costs associated with investigation of an issue (see decision for the only issue sponsored at this time)</p>
<b>New Action Items:</b>	<p><b>Action:</b> Paul Stonner will discuss the importance of participation by all AWG members in noting that not all of the members are being consistently represented.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Robert Laurence has agreed to be the sponsor of the encryption issue.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Karen Anderson agreed to make available to the individuals present the two documents (Technology Infrastructure Blueprint and Technology Policy Guide) that she overviewed in the meeting. These documents have now been posted in the eProject BTA workspace in the file “BTA Deliverables”. Additional instructions are provided in the appendix of these minutes.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Bill Hughes will enter into the eProject workspaces for both BTA and</p>

	<p>Project Management all documents presented in any of the 3 AWG meetings.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Karen Anderson will add imaging, ERM, DMCS (Common Servicing MCS), and eSignature to the list of enterprise-wide issues to be addressed by AWG.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> AWG will review the 2 BTA deliverables (Technology Infrastructure Blueprint and Technology Policy Guide) discussed in the meeting and provide comments to Denise Hill and Karen Anderson by 12/18.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Paul Stonner will seek GM guidance on who needs to own/maintain enterprise-wide Common User Data.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Denise Hill and Paul Stonner will cosponsor the announcement and initial ASG meeting.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Bill Bush will send out links on the SFA Net to the 2 BTA documents (Technology Infrastructure Blueprint and Technology Policy Guide) as soon as the links are available.</p>
<b>Decisions:</b>	<p><b>Issue sponsorship:</b> AWG sponsors investigation of enterprise-wide technology architecture issues. Some technical issues will be handled by the ASG and not elevated to AWG. AWG will be both pro-active as well as reactive to ASG elevated issues.</p> <p><b>Encryption sponsor:</b> Robert Laurence confirmed.</p> <p><b>Definition of sponsor:</b> The sponsor is responsible for the oversight of research and actions leading to presentation(s) and decision(s) by the AWG until the AWG considers the sponsorship closed. Sponsorship implies an enterprise-wide rather than a project specific or channel view of the issue and recommendations.</p> <p><b>Definition of enterprise-wide policy view or documentation:</b> In order to make documents more readable, policy documents should focus on enterprise wide issues and systems (and omit narrow focus systems). It is understood that the technical architecture documentation will be complete.</p> <p><b>Costs associated with sponsorship:</b> In most cases, the first project needing to address the issue will bear the bulk of the cost – as it would have to in any case- but will also take an SFA wide perspective on the issue. If additional funding is needed for specific analysis, the requirement will be examined on a case by case basis and escalated if appropriate.</p> <p><b>Expected updates to key documents:</b> The 2 BTA deliverables (Technology Infrastructure Blueprint and Technology Policy Guide) briefed at the meeting are expected to be updated twice a year by the SFA ITM group and more frequently for major changes. These documents are in the public domain and may be shared with other vendors.</p>
<b>Next Meeting:</b>	<b>Thursday December 20, 2001</b>

Meeting Discussion Items:

- 
- Discuss and clarify roles of AWG and ASG members
    - AWG is the business representation and communication between business and technology. AWG sponsors issues. AWG is more proactive than reactive to ASG escalations.
    - AWG sponsor, as a pilot for future issues, should be from a business unit that needs to address that issue.
    - AWG sponsor manages the actual work (identifying and defining the issue) to be done. The sponsor's project is likely to be the first to address the issue and may also bear the costs. The sponsor provides oversight and seeks an enterprise-wide rather than a project or channel specific solution.
    - ASG is technology oriented. Not all ASG issues are escalated to AWG. ASG is a resource pool of deep technical experts available to the projects.
  - AWG sponsorship for investigation of encryption standards
    - Enterprise encryption standard can be multiple standards for the different situations which require protecting data.
    - Two sources of requirements are the Privacy Act and OMB mandates relating to students. Considerations include overseas access to data.
    - Internal and external data treatment may be different.
    - AWG emphasis should be to tasking experts to provide understanding and options before trying to solve the issue itself.
  - Socialize/ build awareness of BTA deliverables (Technology Infrastructure Blueprint and Technology Policy Guide)
    - Complete documents will be made available to everyone (see actions).
    - The BTA deliverables are public and may be shared with vendors (see decisions).
    - The BTA deliverables are planned to be updated at least every six months.
    - Technical documentation often needs to include all systems, but policy documentation may include major systems while excluding details about narrow focus low density impact systems.
  - Identify enterprise-wide issues
    - Multiple systems often require the same data which can create problems if multiple copies of the same information disagree. An enterprise-wide issue is to identify one data holding system as the "system of record".
    - Some of the "identifier" issues could be merged (eg common student id and common user id)
    - SFA data dictionary. There are questions of ownership of data and of responsibility for maintenance. GM views will be sought. Some cautions needed because this is both a modernization and legacy issue. Often there is more than one solution to the type issue.
    - A major topic is to identify what issues to address first. The "common identifier / user id" is the issue chosen for focus at the next AWG meeting (currently scheduled for 12/20).
    - The SFA ITM group focuses on three topics as driving issues:

- 
- Need for an enterprise agreement defining consistency
  - MIT audit
  - Dept of Ed's driving toward a Common Data Dictionary